

A3924

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 1

disastrous to the economy of the New Jersey resort areas, and I must judge that the same would apply to all areas catering to this great segment of our economy—the convention business. Professional convention managers either employed by corporations or trade associations, have purposely built up the use of resorts for convention purposes because they have a captive audience and are not subject to the distractions of metropolitan areas.

Atlantic City has the largest convention hall in the world, which has just been completely renovated under a \$4 million renovation program, and its floor space increased by thousands of square feet for display of merchandise and other items, which enable an industry to display its accomplishments from year to year, and enables the businessman to keep up with what is new in his line of endeavor. I have watched these conventions personally for years, and I know that they are conducted in a business-like manner, serve a very important purpose in our domestic economy, and the time which is given to social contacts and entertainment does not detract from the serious and fruitful endeavor of the meetings and displays planned months in advance for the convention.

I cannot conceive how any restrictions on convention and business spending will produce \$250 million a year in additional taxes, and such an assumption is quite unrealistic for the following reasons:

First. The money involved is earmarked for sales promotion by most business enterprise. It is unsound to think that any business would not seek to divert such earmarked funds to other areas that are deductible, such as advertising, television, et cetera. The money, thus, will not be brought down in profits to a taxable level.

Second. Such limitation will adversely affect the service industries; that is, transportation, restaurants and hotels, which are large employers. A campaign by Internal Revenue Service has already reduced spending by convention people. In this regard, in most hotels in the resort areas there has been a steady decline in profits for the last 3 years since this antibusiness campaign was started by the Internal Revenue Service. For instance, in one hotel brought to my attention, the income tax was \$16,000 last year as compared to \$200,000 3 years ago. It is my belief that any hope of improving the tax collections through these procedures, will be offset by the reduced taxes produced for so long by the service industries.

I take issue with the Internal Revenue Service when it says that conventions are evidence of willful extravagances and conducted in an unbusinesslike manner. I know the contrary is true from personal observation, and it will be a terrible loss to the Nation to let this segment of business, the convention business, go to pot.

Such recommendations by the Internal Revenue Department is an attempt to introduce discriminatory price fixing by limiting the amount that can be deducted for hotel rooms and meals used by business travelers, and is funda-

mentally unsound. If our country has reached the point in its economy where it demands price fixing and controls, then it should be across the board and not attempt it on any one industry or business, and in no event, should one segment of the economy be discriminated against as would occur under such recommendations.

The inclusion of yachts, hunting lodges, and tropical clubs as income tax deductions by an individual or corporation is wrong, and I can agree that this should not be permitted. However, I do resent the Secretary of the Treasury emphasizing these extreme tax avoiding schemes, and implying they are typical of all business expenditures. I am amazed that the Secretary of the Treasury can say that there should be a per diem limitation applicable to business travel at \$30 a day, and that he would call this realistic. I am sure that he and all other officers and employees in Government would find it very hard to get by on business travel and lodging limited to such an amount.

I am definitely opposed to any such price fixing, and this is what it will amount to, and I insist that the harm and loss to seashore resorts and other areas benefitting from convention and business travel will be a hundredfold greater than any hoped for increase in tax collection.



Paying Castro Blackmail Raises Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, this article from the U.S. News & World Report poses some of the problems raised by making a deal to submit to blackmail by the Communist dictator in Cuba. Americans should give careful study to what is actually involved in departing from our traditional position of refusing to deal with bandits.

The article follows:

U.S. TRACTORS FOR CUBAN PRISONERS—WHAT IT MEANS

Proposed: The biggest ransom deal in U.S. history. The deal itself: Trade 1,214 Cubans held by Castro for 500 U.S. tractors, or about two prisoners per tractor.

Cost involved: About \$15 million. At that figure the deal would average out at \$12,353 per prisoner. Source of funds: Voluntary contributions by individual Americans.

In dispute: A question whether money given to buy tractors is tax-deductible. President Kennedy says it is. Some Members of Congress disagree. A second question is whether the transaction is in violation of the Logan Act, prohibiting private deals with governments that are involved in disputes with the United States. The President says the Act is not applicable. Some Members of Congress disagree with this, too. A third question, raised by Castro, is whether the proposed transaction is to be regarded as a payment by the United States of an indemnity for damage caused in the recent unsuccessful attempt to invade Cuba.

U.S. position: President Kennedy is giving complete support to the fund-raising campaign, but insists that this entire venture is in the hands of private citizens and in no way involves the U.S. Government.

Castro position: To the Cuban dictator, acceptance of his terms must amount to an admission by the U.S. Government of its part in the attempted invasion of Cuba.

In charge: The Tractors for Freedom Committee, headed by Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt; Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers, and Milton S. Eisenhower, brother of the former President, has spearheaded the dealing.

Problems: How to get and check identification of the 1,214 persons Castro has suggested for exchange. Then, how to make sure that the prisoners are actually exchanged for the tractors. One idea is that, as each tractor is delivered, two prisoners would have to be freed. Just how the entire swap arrangement is to be policed was left unclear at the start.

Castro's concern: It dawned upon the dictator—a few days after he made his original offer on May 18—that a trade of prisoners for tractors would place him before the world as one who rated machines above human beings. It also seems to have dawned upon Castro that he was in the position of a common blackmailer. That's when he switched to the idea of calling his proposal in indemnity rather than an exchange of men for machines.

The meaning: Castro is in desperate need of mechanical equipment. Also, Soviet Russia either is unable or unwilling to deliver the needed equipment. Cuba's dictator, in trouble, has turned to an attempt to exact tribute.

The ransom: Castro sent 10 temporarily paroled prisoners to Washington with orders for 200 large tractors equipped with plowing disks and 300 equipped with bulldozer blades. Some of these track-type tractors are more suitable for big construction jobs than for farming. The types specified sell for more than \$30,000 each. Fear is that they would be used to build military bases in Cuba.

Blackmail spelled out: If the deal falls through, the men are threatened by Castro with long prison terms, doing the work of the machines. Broad hints were dropped that some prisoners would be executed. As talks proceeded, Castro added other ransom conditions, talked of getting back pro-Castroites jailed, for one reason or another, in this country and elsewhere.

Opposition: Many Congressmen, Democrats and Republicans, have been cool to the idea of exchanging U.S. tractors for the Cuban prisoners. Excerpts from debate in the U.S. Senate on May 22, carried on these pages, reveal the line of congressional thinking.

What history shows: For the United States, the idea of paying ransom for human lives is relatively new, forced on this country by Communist regimes that find the United States increasingly ready to pay tribute. This willingness was not always the case. Dates in history show the trend—

In 1797. To demands that United States pay bribes of \$240,000 to French officials, Charles C. Pinckney, the U.S. Minister to Paris, proclaimed: "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute." Final U.S. reply was an undeclared naval war on France that continued for 2 years, led to cooperation without tribute.

In 1904. A naturalized U.S. citizen of Greek origin, Ion Perdicaris, was seized in Morocco by a chieftain named Raisuli. President Theodore Roosevelt, told ransom was demanded, sent the fleet to the area and ordered this message sent to Tangiers: "Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead." Perdicaris was freed.

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3923

to France, Charles Pinckney, declared with a clear voice, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

Contrast our present attitude toward Cuba today. When Castro asks tribute in ransom for 1,200 Cuban invaders, some so-called leaders run helter skelter to raise ransom money to pay for tractors demanded by Fidel Castro. These so-called leaders camouflage their softness with humanitarianism and weasel words that ransom is an exchange of machine for men, while Castro calls these payments indemnification and reparations for invasion. This is a demonstration of humanism gone astray. Any payment made by Americans for the release of Cuban freedom fighters is blackmail and tribute. I, for one, do not approve such tribute. I believe veterans do not approve of blackmail. What has happened to the spirit of America?

Our Declaration of Independence declares that all men are created equal, and yet the citizens of Alabama stop freedom riders, white and black, from traveling through their State. Our Supreme Court in 1954 ordered desegregation and our Federal Government had to send troops into Little Rock to guarantee the safety of a few Negro children to attend school.

Today is more than a Memorial Day. It is a day of rededication to those high ideals for which those men died. While we are aware of the faults and frailties of our human makeup and the selfishness of some, let us not forget the great heart of our great American people when called upon for great causes. Sometimes we are overgenerous.

This year in Washington we have sought to help the unemployed, to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to comfort the sick and the aged, to house the inadequately sheltered, to educate the youth, to provide the opportunity for the brilliant and the skilled, to attend the wounded and the disabled. We have demonstrated, and we are demonstrating, that ours is a Government which cares. Just as we have helped our own, we have shown our generosity to the peoples of Asia, Africa, and South America by helping them with funds to help themselves. Our Vice President, LYNDON JOHNSON, has reported that the peoples of Asia want, not arms but funds to help their economy. We are generous because we recognize that we are our brothers' keepers and because it is right. We know that if we cannot help the many who are poor, we cannot save the few who are rich or well off.

Remember, my friends, that our Nation has remained free because civil authority has been always superior to military authority, except in times of national emergency. Our budget provides for \$47 billion for military affairs. Such great expenditures are needed for defense, but they carry with them great danger. We may be confronted by a military caste and a militaristic mentality. By the military caste I do not mean the GI, but the professional soldier. Place too much authority in the military or in one man, and we pave the road to tyranny and oppression. Deny a man equal rights before the law or deny him the protection of the Bill of Rights, and you whittle away at your own freedom. Liberty does not always die from direct attack. If liberty ever dies in America—and I hope we shall never see the day—it will die from the decay of the principles that gave it life: that is justice and equality and that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the State but from the hand of God. But we are determined to be free, and we are ready to pay the cost, however great. We shall not be stamped by fear, prejudice, or threats. With God's grace and the support of all veterans and all men who are devoted to the principles of our Nation, our democ-

cracy will live and continue to flourish amid lawlessness and tyranny.

When we adhere to the principles of justice, equality, and brotherhood, we will have kept faith with those who died.

The Myth of Doing Something

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we so often hear the expression about the present administration doing something, I feel that the following article by Richard W. Owens as published in the June issue of the California Farm Bureau Federation Monthly is of particular importance.

The article follows:

THE MYTH OF DOING SOMETHING

The history of our country contains examples of many men who have gained fame and fortune by "getting something done." As a matter of fact, getting something done has long been regarded as a mark of individual initiative and fortitude.

Our great industries have resulted from the efforts of those who have done something. Land has been developed, new crops introduced, machines made available, and many other things accomplished by men who get things done.

Unfortunately, the Socialists and others who favor centralization of government have seized upon the symbol of "getting something done" to further their cause of control and regimentation. They know the average American citizen admires action and accomplishment.

How often have you heard someone make the comment—whether about a piece of legislation or an international crisis—I don't know if it's good or bad, but at least we are doing something for a change.

Using good psychology, the centralizers depict themselves as the champions of political initiative and action. Anyone who recognizes and speaks out against the evils of socialism, they brand as "do nothings."

The top spokesman for the AFL-CIO, which appears to be the most powerful monopoly in California, stated in a recent release that the 1961 session of the California Legislature may go down in history as the "do nothing session." Why? Because, in his opinion, "there isn't enough money to meet the needs of many important programs." The recommended cure? Pass legislation on which we may obtain more Federal appropriations.

However, this criticism is not solely of political spokesmen. Individuals if they desire it enough could be their own action change the words of their spokesman or representative.

An insight into some individuals' way of thinking on the matter of "doing something" was given in a recent article in *Christian Economics* by Dr. Hans F. Sennholz, who pointed out the following:

"The advocate of foreign aid who depicts in dark colors the misery and suffering in foreign countries does not mean to act himself when he demands action and initiative in this field of social endeavor. He does not mean to send CARE packages to starving Asians and Africans. And he does not plan

to invest his savings in the socialized economies of India or the Congo. He probably knows rather well that his investments would soon be consumed, squandered, and confiscated by governments that are hostile to capital investments. And yet, he calls on his Government to waste billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money.

"The advocate of more abundant and better housing does not mean to use his own funds to provide low-rent housing. He, himself, does not want to act; he only calls on the Government for action. It is the Government whose initiative and action he would like to employ and the people's tax money he proposes to spend. He, himself, probably is a tenant complaining about high rentals while shunning the tasks and responsibilities of homeownership. He is probably aware that the returns on apartment house investments are mostly meager and always jeopardized by rising taxes and Government controls. Therefore, he prefers safer investments with less worry to him.

"The apostle of rapid economic growth does not advocate personal initiative and action. He does not mean to offer his own effort and thrift toward economic growth. It takes more than \$15,000 in savings to create an additional job. Even more savings are needed if the job is to be more productive with higher wages and better working conditions. In his personal life the growth apostle probably is spending next month's income on consumption, relying mainly on charge accounts and installment loans. He, himself, does not save the capital that is needed for economic growth. His call for initiative and action is merely a call for Government expenditures financed with the people's money or through inflation."

When viewed in its proper perspective, the question "Don't you want to do anything?" becomes a myth. What is actually being asked is "Don't you want the Government to manage the spending of your money on foreign aid, housing, education, economic growth, health insurance?"

Disaster for Resort Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative of the Second Congressional District of New Jersey, I am quite familiar with a segment of our economy which has grown and been encouraged as a source of income to our resort areas. My district includes Atlantic City and a number of smaller seashore resorts, which depend to a great extent on convention business. This is particularly true in the off season, when the facilities such as hotels and restaurants are occupied and kept busy by conventions from all over the United States, Canada, and even the world.

These conventions draw thousands of business representatives, and they, naturally, use their expense accounts. It has been estimated that over 50 percent of the income of one of the larger hotels in Atlantic City is derived from convention people. Any curtailment of the use of an expense account will be

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3925

In 1949, Robert A. Vogeler, U.S. businessman, was jailed in Communist Hungary and charged with espionage. He was freed a year and a half later, after the United States agreed to hand over Hungarian assets seized in West Germany, as part of the ransom.

In 1951, Soviet fighter planes forced down four U.S. airmen over Hungary. The Americans were released after 6 weeks—but only after the United States paid ransom of \$123,605, a Communist price tag of \$30,901.25 on each American head.

Recent record is filled with other examples of how Communists use prisoners for bargaining purposes—in Soviet Russia, Communist Czechoslovakia, Red China.

Dangers involved: Continuing to submit to Communist blackmail is seen by many as a trend that must be halted. Representative BRUCE ALGER, Republican, of Texas, warns that if the Cuba deal goes through, "It will not be many days until other two-bit bandits and potential dictators will be seizing American tourists and holding them for ransom * * * fair targets to a worldwide kidnapping ring."

Others make this point: Castro is reportedly holding at least 150,000 Cubans in jails. Will he next try to sell them, in batches of 1,000 or so, to meet needs for U.S. trucks, refineries, cash to consolidate his revolution?

Morals involved: Those behind "Tractors for Freedom" insist that Americans have a moral obligation to help the prisoners. Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida, declares: "Americans will be sickened by this man's utter contempt of the human person, but they will want to save the lives of these men. I say, let us buy back for them their liberty and their lives."

For U.S. citizens, as well as for U.S. officials, there was a sudden new problem: How do free men best deal with a dictator's demands for blackmail?

Why Investigations?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, the following article entitled "Why Investigations?" by Mr. Roy M. Brewer, appeared in the June 1961, issue of the American Legion magazine. Because of its timely significance, I believe it should be circulated widely because of the lack of understanding by many when a committee of Congress is authorized to conduct an investigation. I therefore include it herewith:

WHY INVESTIGATIONS?

(By Roy M. Brewer)

Is there really a domestic Communist menace? Is there a need for congressional committees to investigate Communist subversion? Do the tactics of such committees constitute a greater threat to freedom and liberty than the groups they are assigned to investigate? These are some of the questions which Americans are asking themselves as a result of the furor that has been kicked up by recent agitation against the congressional committees investigating communism.

These are serious questions which deserve serious answers. For in this area of confusion rests the key to the future of the free world. America and the free world have suffered setbacks in recent years that have

caused us genuine concern for our future. These setbacks arise from our failure to understand the Communist problem at home and to equate our failures at home with our setbacks abroad. The confusion about congressional committees is evidence of this lack of understanding.

Yes, there is a Communist menace at home. Yes, we do need investigations. We need investigations that will concentrate on communism and not get sidetracked on extraneous issues. There is no real question of the need for, or of the conduct of, such committees. The problem is in understanding the Communist menace and how it works. The future of our country and its precious political heritage depend on it. America must learn that the fight against communism begins at home. Unless and until we do understand this, we will continue to lose to communism abroad.

Recently the House of Representatives voted 412 to 6 to give the House Committee on Un-American Activities its full appropriation of \$331,000 to carry on its work of investigation. The near unanimity of this vote surprised a lot of persons. The opposition to the committee that has recently appeared not only from the Communists and their camp followers, but in the form of editorials in the New York Times and the Washington Post, and from large groups of clergymen, had caused some persons to believe, and the Communists to hope, that this opposition would reflect itself in the vote on the House appropriation. It is to the credit of Congress as well as being the good fortune of the American people that Congress understands the tactics of communism and recognizes the indispensable work which the committees of both Houses of Congress are doing.

The agitation against such committees is nothing new to Congress. It has been going on since the committees were first formed, for it is in these committees more than at any other place, that the sensitive nerve structure of the Communist apparatus is laid bare for the American people to see. It is through the committees that you see the work of the periphery groups and the manner in which these groups form a protective covering around the activities of the Communist Party itself and its illegal activities in espionage and subversion. Without this protective covering the apparatus would be impotent and ineffectual.

Unfortunately the public does not fully understand this. They have supported the activities of the committees in exposing the hard-core or the card-carrying Communist, but they have felt, in giving out information on fellow travelers, dupes, and innocents, that the committee was unnecessarily smearing innocent persons. Thus the Communists have been able to create opposition to the committees, to distort their efforts and their purpose and to divert attention from the real Communist issue.

In reviewing the history of these committees since 1939, it is clear that each time a major exposé of Communist infiltration has been made, the Communists were able to confuse the issue and divert the attention of the public to an entirely different question.

A good example of this was the case of J. Robert Oppenheimer who was let go as a security risk. This was the only real issue. Yet most of the people reached the conclusion that he had been mistreated because he was not proven to be a card-carrying Communist. In his own testimony he admitted that he had consciously hired persons whom he knew to be Communists, on the most secret project in the history of the world. He attempted to justify this by saying that he thought their loyalty to America superseded their loyalty to the Communist Party, which, of course, is the height of folly to one who knows how the Communist Party works.

The ability of the Communists to confuse the issues involved in these investigations

shows masterful strategy. If we understand how and why they confuse the issue we will clearly see that the committees are performing an important function—that we need to support them and learn to evaluate accurately the information which they disclose. But to assume that you can investigate Communist subversion without disclosing the work of the periphery groups, is to condemn them before they start to work.

It is interesting to note how the Communists have been able to get a completely different reaction to the same basic principle when it affects them than when applied to others. For example, it is considered liberal or humanitarian to fight totalitarianism in the form of fascism and nazism, but it is reactionary to fight totalitarianism in the form of communism. This is the feeling which you will get subconsciously from an average person who is not close to the subject. By the same token they have been able to get the American public to assume an entirely different attitude toward congressional committees which deal with communism than toward those which deal in other areas of public concern.

Historically the liberal or progressive line of thought in America has always supported the congressional investigating committee as an instrument of the people's interest as against that of vested interests or of special interest groups. This was true when Senator Wheeler exposed the Teapot Dome scandal. It was true when Senators LaFollette and Norris were uncovering the excesses of industry monopolies in the 1920's. It was certainly true when young Bob LaFollette was investigating the abuses of civil rights in the 1930's. It was true of the activities of the Kefauver committee which scrutinized crime and of the McClellan committee which investigated Beck and Hoffa. While there was great resentment against McCarthy for his personal animosity toward General Zwicker and others there was no similar resentment against McClellan and Bob Kennedy who made no secret of their determination to get Hoffa and Beck. It is only when you take on the Communists in congressional committees that the entire process is given the appearance of evil.

The first great drive to discredit congressional committees investigating communism came with the Dies committee in 1939. When its first public hearing was set up, information began to flow to the committee of such a sensational nature that almost overnight the committee itself became the issue. The public just couldn't and wouldn't believe what we now know were accurate accounts of infiltration into government, labor unions, communications, the arts and education. Taking advantage of the public's disbelief, the Communists launched an attack on the motives of the committee and its members. Those who were embarrassed by the disclosures, many of whom sincerely believed the charges against the committee, joined the chorus of condemnation.

There were mistakes made by the Dies committee. The technique of Communist infiltration and subversion was new to most people. The idea of boring from within was a relatively new tactic, even to the Communists. So it is understandable that persons who were suddenly exposed to this revelation of subversion would be carried away. It is also understandable that they did not fully evaluate the power of the Communists to deceive persons in their orbit of influence thus assuming that many persons were knowingly cooperating with the Communists when actually they were being deceived by them. The power of communism to deceive its victims is almost unbelievably effective.

But did the Dies committee deserve the fate which it received? We don't think so, for certainly the intentions of the committee were good. Had it not been for the program of character assassination, lies and

A3926

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 1

distortions that only the Communists can so effectively impose, it would have worked out its problems and developed an acceptable technique as other committees have done. But they didn't really have a chance.

Here is an excerpt from the statement of Congressman Dies when he called the first public hearing to order. "The Chair wishes to reiterate what it has stated many times—namely, that this committee is determined to conduct its investigation upon a dignified plane and to adopt and maintain throughout the course of the hearings a judicial attitude. The committee has no preconceived views of what the truth is respecting the subject matter of this inquiry. Its sole purpose is to discover the truth and report it as it is, with such recommendations, if any, as to legislation on these subjects as the situation may require and as the duty of Congress to the American people may demand.

"We shall be fair and impartial at all times and treat every witness with fairness and courtesy. We shall expect every witness to treat us in the same way. This committee will not permit any 'character assassination' or any 'smearing' of innocent people. We wish to caution witnesses that reckless charges must not be made against individuals or organizations.

"The Chair wishes to make it plain that this committee is not 'after anyone.' All that we are concerned with is the ascertainment of the truth, whatever it is."

Certainly the purposes enunciated here would meet the standards of the most critical. Those who have seen the conduct of the Communists appearing before the committee in San Francisco in the film "Operation Abolition" can well understand why the committee could not function in the manner outlined by the chairman at this first public hearing under his chairmanship. It is significant to note that the first witness of the Dies committee was one of their investigators who had been assigned to investigate the German-American Bund. The second witness, appearing voluntarily, was John P. Frey, president of the Metal Trades Division of the American Federation of Labor who gave voluminous testimony of Communist infiltration into labor unions.

But unfortunately the public was not yet ready for the information that came to the Dies committee. It was too much to be believed and the conflict over the committee soon became a conflict between its chairman and the New Deal. The full weight of the Roosevelt administration was brought to bear against the committee and its chairman. The committee was successfully discredited—and Chairman Dies retired from public life for several years, returning again in the 1950's.

The sad fate of the Dies committee discouraged any such investigation for a period of almost 8 years. During the war, of course, we were cobelligerents with Russia and it was the fashion to be friendly. But in 1947 the House committee set a major inquiry into the Hollywood motion picture industry. Stories had been coming out of the Tenny committee in California about Communist influences in Hollywood but the principal witness had been challenged as mentally incompetent, so few people believed them.

When the small group of friendly witnesses gathered in Washington in the fall of 1947, they were looked upon by the army of press, radio and motion picture representatives as a group of crackpots. The industry under the leadership of the Motion Picture Producers Association had called an industry-wide meeting to protect itself from the "smear campaign" of the committee. The committee was now under Republican leadership and it was alleged that its purpose was to discredit Hollywood because it had so strongly supported the New Deal. The "Committee for the First Amendment" was

formed under the leadership of John Huston and William Wyler and a "galaxy" of stars was flown to Washington to expose and publicize the evil intent of the committee.

The friendly witnesses were called. They testified as to their experiences but their testimony was generally discounted. However, when John Howard Lawson, who had been dubbed the Communist commissar of Hollywood, was called, he reacted in a way that shocked the most skeptical. He defied the committee, called the chairman "Hitler" and was dragged from the hearing room screaming invective at the committee. The reaction was immediate. Industry leaders met in New York and promised a cleanup. The Committee for the First Amendment was dissolved forthwith and its glamorous members slipped back to Hollywood as quietly and as unobtrusively as possible.

The Hollywood hearing gave the committee a real boost. For the first time the public accepted the necessity for such investigations. It is significant to note, however, that this boost came as a result of action that was taken by the Communists themselves. It did not come because the committee had done anything that differed one bit from its previous method.

Shortly after this, the Hiss case broke and all previous disclosures paled into insignificance before the fantastic charge of Whitaker Chambers. The very magnitude of the accusation played into the Communists' hands. It was too outrageous to be believed. Alger Hiss a hidden Communist. This handsome, educated, cultured, sensitive, dedicated public servant a Communist—impossible. A wave of indignation swept over the Nation and soon it was not Alger Hiss who was on trial—it was Whitaker Chambers and the committee. The tremendous pressure that descended upon Chambers would have crushed a lesser man. But he stood his ground and he proved that Alger Hiss had lied.

Despite the seriousness of this charge the realities of it were never completely accepted. No effort was made by responsible officials of Government to determine the extent of the penetration into the State Department. Logic would indicate that if one in such a high post was a Communist there must be others. But logic was not governing the actions of our officials. In a display of emotion, Dean Acheson, on whom the initial responsibility rested, said he would not turn his back on Alger Hiss. He had refused to accept the realities of the disclosure. The Nation generally accepted the facts of the Alger Hiss case but the issue was left up in the air.

After this the scene shifted to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee when Senator Joseph McCarthy took over the chairmanship. McCarthy had not been a student of communism but on becoming acquainted with some of the fact of Communist infiltration he charged into the fight with the reckless abandon of a Don Quixote. He was on the right track but he didn't understand the pitfalls. He didn't realize how difficult it would be to make his charges stand up. He hadn't fully appraised the enemy he was taking on.

When the McCarthy hearings started, the public was behind him. They were shocked at the list of persons in the State Department whom he charged were Communists, but the Hiss case had taught them not to prejudge. They were ready to be convinced. But the proof was not sufficiently convincing to justify the extent of the charges—at least a substantial portion of the public didn't think that it was. In the period of hesitation, once more the issue was shifted—communism became a secondary issue and Joe McCarthy was on trial.

Few issues in American life have stirred the emotions of the public as deeply as the McCarthy hearings. Few men in public life have been subjected to the campaign of

villification that was used against Joe McCarthy. He was correct in his premise that the Communists had great influence in the State Department and that serious charges were justified. But he made some mistakes and these mistakes were pounced upon with all the skill the Communists use so well.

The climax of the McCarthy hearings came with testimony of infiltration into the Army radar laboratory at Fort Monmouth, N.J. McCarthy had uncovered evidence of a serious leak of vital, secret information. He felt that the Army was giving him the run-around and no doubt he was right. Once again the Communist issue was sidetracked and the conflict became a fight between McCarthy and the Army. The President joined the fight on the side of the Army and the full strength of the Eisenhower administration was brought to bear to suppress the hearings successfully and to break Senator McCarthy politically. The American people have yet to learn who was responsible for the promotion of Major Peress.

The bitterness of the McCarthy dispute left a lasting effect on the anti-Communist fight in America. A feeling began to emerge that you could not successfully contain communism in a free society such as ours without destroying our basic liberties. This, of course, is a complete fallacy, but nonetheless it has been assiduously promoted and many take it for granted. The effect has been to give a certain legitimacy to communism in America that it had never enjoyed before.

Thus the struggle had gone one more cycle and the Communists had scored the greatest victory of all. As a result security regulations were relaxed—court decisions freed the hard core of the Communist movement in America. In a number of verdicts the Supreme Court so restricted our law enforcement officials as to make America safe, not only for Communists, but for the hardened criminals of the underworld as well.

As we review the struggle in retrospect it seems clear that as each cycle of disclosure and defeat has been completed, from Dies to Thomas to McCarthy, our own defense has emerged a little weaker and the Communists have become more firmly entrenched. After each defeat a new area has been opened up to them to expand their influence.

The people have not weakened in their opposition to communism, but they are frustrated in their efforts to know how to apply their opposition effectively. Our national leadership has failed to show them the way, not because they are pro-Communists but rather because it is so much easier to deny the facts than it is to face them. This has been true of each administration since World War II. As early as 1939 Whitaker Chambers met with a high official of our State Department in an effort to acquaint him with the manner in which our Government was being infiltrated. His information, to all intents and purposes, was ignored.

When the charges against Alger Hiss were disclosed, President Truman said the issue was a red herring. In 1954 the Eisenhower administration suppressed the Monmouth investigation rather than face the facts the McCarthy committee had uncovered.

Are these incidents evidence of sympathy with communism? No, decidedly not. The percentage of persons in America who have any real sympathy for communism is so small as to be of no consequence. But it is evidence of a failure to appraise our enemy properly. It is also evidence of a certain amount of lethargy. I repeat—it is so much easier to deny the facts than it is to face them.

The free world is paying a terrible price for this attitude. All of the major problems of the world today are directly traceable to it: The peace treaties which gave Russia occupation rights over those countries which are now the captive nations; the loss of China as a result of our failure to under-

There has not so far been much of that evident generally in Washington. I believe some of our Federal administrators, instead of making speeches accusing the merchant marine industry of congenital law breaking might better spend the time considering how they might devise a law which can be enforced with an even hand. Or, before sternly advising us that we bring our complaints to the Board, he might inquire about the complaints that we have brought and, from the nature of the practical unenforceability of the act abroad, the profound inactivity that these complaints have produced.

There are notable exceptions to this, however, and fortunately there are more constructive speeches made in the interests of world trade and the merchant marine than otherwise.

WHERE ARE WE?

Whatever lack of artistry may show in the picture I have painted, it is obvious that I have so far chosen only the dark and somber colors for my brush. I don't really think things are all that bad. The facts that give me heart are many. Among them are:

1. The shipping industry has a job to do which is of the highest order of importance, and challenges each of us to his utmost.

2. It is a job packed tight with danger, and excitement, and fun. From the seaman who risks his life in a gale to the investor who assumes sizable risks for a return about equal to that of a Government bond, it is an exciting and challenging way of life.

3. The Government officials, both in the Congress and in the executive, of whom I have been somewhat critical, are able and conscientious men. In time, and that a short time, they must see where they are driving the American merchant marine. When that is seen, they will turn their imagination and their ability into the search for ways to achieve uniform enforcement of the law against all lines in the U.S. trades. A merchant marine is an instrument of world power as well as world trade. As I have indicated, the Russians are beginning to see this—so must we.

4. Lastly, but by no means least, our work puts us at the service of the splendid men of commerce and industry and labor, such as you who are here today. You need us and we need you, and it is a pleasure to serve you.

If I have indicated in clinical detail the worries we face, it is because we ask your understanding, not your sympathy.

In closing I should like to pay my own tribute and respects to you who have cast your lot in the challenging role of commerce and shipping. The contribution which you make helps to insure that our country's flag will continue flying on the sealanes of the world.

I should expect, if you have listened with moderate attention, that there is not a man in the room who would trade jobs with me. I hope that is so. For in honest fact, and for reasons which quite defy rational explanation, I wouldn't trade with any of you. The poets say that the moon doth drive men mad. Salt spray, I fear, will do the same.

Must We Pay Ransom to Red Castro?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, opposition across the country is rising by leaps

and bounds to the preposterous proposal to involve the United States, officially, in the unconscionable appeasement of paying ransom money to Cuba's Red Castro in response to his brazen attempt to blackmail us into submission to his demands.

I am glad to read in a recent dispatch in News-Week that Secretary of the Treasury Dillon is opposed to the scheme to make this ransom payment tax exempt and thus put our Government officially in the sorry business of paying blackmail with the taxpayers' money since dollars for tribute which pay no taxes are the same as using money from the general Federal fund to try to buy favor from Castro. I sincerely hope that the wise counsel of officials like Secretary Dillon and Senator HARRY BYRD of Virginia will prevail but if necessary I trust Congress will enact a specific legislation denying tax exemption to the funds which Mr. Reuther and others are now trying to collect for this shameful tractor-for-Cubans transaction.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to insert two pertinent statements on this controversy. One is from the Daily Plainsman, of Huron S. Dak., which summarizes the situation neatly in its editorial headline entitled, "Spineless America Pays Ransome as Cuba Starts Open Blackmail" and the other is a column written by Roscoe Drummond entitled, "People For Tractors?"

It seems to me that the final paragraph of the Drummond article should give all good Americans genuine concern before they commit themselves to participate in this awesome enterprise. Mr. Drummond emphasizes that—

The point is that all the Cuban people, not just the captured invasion fighters, are Castro's prisoners.

Thus we face the decision—

By strengthening the hand of Castro do we want to empower him to enslave still more of his fellow Cubans for still longer periods of time under the guise of freeing a few in exchange for the tools he needs to develop power enough to enslave the many.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Huron (S. Dak.) Daily Plainsman, May 24, 1961]

SPINELESS AMERICA PAYS RANSOM AS CUBA STARTS OPEN BLACKMAIL

It has been a long time since the United States answered demands for blackmail with such ringing defiance and courage as:

"Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute."

"Perdicaris alive or Ralsuli dead."

Today the United States is again being blackmailed. This time it is Fidel Castro who threatens to kill a thousand captives from the refugee forces who landed under American auspices at the Bay of Pigs unless the United States sends him 500 tractors.

And what is today's answer to blackmail?

Today a committee has formed itself in the United States to put on a public drive to raise money to pay the ransom.

How flabby, how mushy, how spineless can a nation get and still hope to remain a nation?

[From the Washington Post, May 27, 1961]

PEOPLE FOR TRACTORS?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The Premier of the Cuban-Soviet Socialist Republic, one Fidel Castro, estimates that the lives of 2% Cuban prisoners ought to be worth one bulldozer or one truck with spare parts. He gives the United States 10 days to come through—or else.

The fact that such Americans as Eleanor Roosevelt, Milton Eisenhower, Walter Reuther, Joseph Dodge, and others, instantly volunteer to help raise the money to buy the freedom of the 1,200 Cubans who were captured during the invasion shows that the plight of the Freedom Fighters instinctively touches the heart and conscience of this Nation. The money is already coming in.

I am not sure this is the way to help Cuba or the United States or enslaved people anywhere. But if we are going through with it—let us recognize what we are doing, name this Castro thing for what it is and not pretend that the U.S. Government somehow has nothing to do with it.

This is crude, brazen, high-handed international blackmail perpetrated by a political dictator who is proposing to trade human beings for metal in order to make himself stronger.

This is a dangerous business. Once a nation yields to blackmail, where does it stop? What next? If we yield up 500 trucks and bulldozers to Castro, aren't we inviting some other country to throw a few Americans in prison to trade for a dozen airplanes, a steel mill, or a low-interest loan?

There is no way whatsoever to make this Castro thing a little detached, personal deal between a few private American citizens and somebody or other in Havana—with the Government of the United States involved.

Administration officials would like to keep the Government out of it. It seems to me impossible. After a conference at the White House, Speaker Sam Rayburn reported: "The President said the Federal Government is out of it and going to stay out of it."

Mrs. Roosevelt said: "We have the agreement of the Government. We got permission beforehand."

The hard fact is that the deal cannot be brought off without some Government participation. The Logan Act makes it unlawful for private citizens to negotiate with a foreign government "with intent to influence its conduct in any disputes or controversies with the United States." President Kennedy says he is advised that the Logan Act is not involved because the people-for-tractors deal is not a controversy. But since Castro has stated that he views the tractor "gift" as "indemnity" or reparations for the invasion, there seems to me a very real controversy here.

I cannot see how the Americans can go to Havana to negotiate the prisoner-tractor arrangement without breaking the law unless they have the authority of the Government. If they have this authority, then the United States makes itself a partner to the deal.

If this deal is to be realized, as its sponsors have described it, then the United States will have to participate at four points: the Government will have to issue export licenses for the machinery, issue visas for the negotiators, authorize them to negotiate so as not to violate the Logan Act, and make contributions tax deductible. The latter action means that the United States would be paying for part of the cost.

All this is why Senator WILLIAM J. FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has said: "I agree that our Government should not in any way lend itself to this kind of blackmailing operation."

Senator STYLES BRIDGES of New Hampshire put it this way on the floor of the Senate: "Not since the days of Hitler, when the in-

tion to protect the public treasury leads to there being a differential between what we are paid and what is really necessary to equalize competitive costs in the subsidized categories of expense. (b) We are subject to a complete governmental control as to routes and sailings; however expert or sympathetic this may be, and it is not always both, it is as you can imagine both costly and frustrating to reach day-to-day decisions always subject to the delays and uncertainties of Government approval. (c) We have to pay over to the Government 50 percent of all profits earned in excess of 10 percent of a many-horned mythological beast known as "capital necessarily employed." (d) We are subject to intricate and detailed accounting and audit controls, such that our accounting costs per dollar of revenue are surely the highest in the world. (e) Indeed, none of our administrative and overhead expense, though accomplished with personnel several times as expensive as our foreign competitors, is equalized.

In addition to these unequal costs of operations, and probably more serious than all of them combined, is the fact that we become bound to a fairly inflexible vessel replacement program. Our vessel types must be approved by the Board and our construction dates are fixed, years in advance, according to the calendar age of our ships and the industrywide scheduling of shipyard construction. We have, for one example, one trade which earns a very modest profit with old vessels but which, as we know from experience, would lose large sums if conducted with new, expensive ships. Yet we are being required to obtain such new and, even after payment of the differential, expensive vessels for this service. Ours is surely the only merchant marine in the world which would give serious thought to "improving" a satisfactory service into a financial catastrophe.

THE SHIPPING OUTLOOK

The shipping industry, I am sorry to say, thrives on international trouble and grows thin in place times. This permits an analogy either to the undertaker or the insured. I prefer the latter analogy.

In any case, our ships have been full and our rates attractive during prewar and postwar periods, and when the Suez Canal was closed. For the last several years, the fleets of the world have been seriously in excess of demand and our trades overtonnaged.

An end of the present recession, which apparently may now be expected, and a full-scale revival of international trade would help greatly. But even in that event, there are still going to be many more ships on the loading berths of the world than there are shipments to fill them. This does not mean that I am predicting disaster to the American lines, but it does mean that I can see in prospect no period of large earnings.

The reason for this is apparent. The participation of American flagships in the commerce of the world has steadily declined since the war until today we are carrying actually less than 10 percent of America's world trade.

One of the basic causes of this decline, together with some accidents of litigation and legislation, have led to a new and most serious threat to the American merchant marine.

The demon in this picture involves the recurrent rate wars in the foreign steamship industry which cannot be effectively prevented by the government of any one country, because each movement of cargo is in the foreign trade of two countries, not one. In short, it is international. Since there can be no effective governmental ratemaking, an attempt is made to avoid chaos by the steamship lines themselves entering agreements in each trade to establish uniform rate tariffs for that trade. This is called the conference system.

In 1958 the Supreme Court held invalid the contract rate system, by which the members of a conference give a freight reduction of about 10 percent to those who give the conference members all their business. The Congress gave temporary legality to these systems, and launched two thorough-going inquiries. One, by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, was directed at the dual-rate problem. A second, by the House Antitrust Subcommittee under Congressman CELLER, was directed to the antitrust implications of steamship regulation and to the degree to which the regulatory statute, the Shipping Act of 1916, had been enforced or obeyed.

Both inquiries were made with thoroughness and competence. The Antitrust Subcommittee has by the nature of its inquiry produced the most trouble for us. They sent able lawyers into the files of American lines who examined tens of thousands of transactions over the course of a decade. They found a few apparent violations of the 1916 Shipping Act. Curiously enough, considering this was an antitrust committee, most of the violations complained of involved breaches of agreements for rate equality—in other words, the dereliction was one of reducing rates.

Chairman CELLER has declared with some understandable vigor that his committee has unearthed 177 "violations" of Federal statutes. This, as is often the way with numbers, added up to 184 violations when the Federal Maritime Board rendered a report to Congressman CELLER as of March 1, 1961. We find from its report that 64 of these matters were not violations at all, that 17 were time barred or trivial, that 32 were matters appropriate for rulemaking, not penalty proceedings, and that 14 were matters outside the Board jurisdiction and were referred to other agencies. This leaves only 25 matters set for hearing and 30 still under investigation. No violation has yet been determined.

Even when reduced to a small fraction of the congressional charges, the result is not a happy one. The industry and its executives, including myself, must accept full responsibility for any violation of law which may in the end be shown. I don't want to minimize that responsibility by sharing it with the Government, but the plain fact is that there has not from 1916 until 1960 been any determined effort by the Federal Maritime Board or its predecessors to enforce the law. There are good and sufficient reasons for this: its energies have probably wisely, during and after two wars, been directed toward fleet development. Secondly, in many respects the Shipping Act is in the best of circumstances quite unenforceable. The fact remains that we have been without an effective policeman for 45 years, and that the occasional complaints to the Board of malpractices, made by lines who have always tried to obey the law, which were injuring them in the competitive struggle have produced no results whatever.

I believe the Board now intends to do all that it possibly can to enforce the act. This is, or rather should be, good news for the American lines. We are the high-cost carriers, and ours is a business morality pretty closely in tune with the 1916 act. It is to our heavy interest that rebates, secret rate cutting, and all other special inducements to get cargo be completely banished from the ocean trades.

SHIPPING REGULATIONS

Yet, paradoxically enough, the U.S.-flag lines now face their greatest threat from the efforts of the Board rigorously to enforce the act.

That is because as a simple, practical fact the Board has not the power effectively to enforce the act against foreign-flag lines with respect to transactions which occur abroad. This weakness did not evidence it-

self when the enforcement of the Shipping Act was in a somnolent state for the many years since its passage. But now that an attempt is being made to enforce the law, this basic inability of the United States to control transactions occurring abroad is becoming increasingly clear to us. Thus it cannot obtain witnesses by compulsory process from abroad. Its power to demand foreign-held documents is now under challenge in the courts. Even if its power be sustained by the courts or granted by the Congress, many of the foreign governments have directed their nationals not to supply these documents, leaving the issue for the slow and uncertain disposition offered by diplomatic negotiation. Even if the theoretical power is in the end achieved, it will quite probably do the Board little or no practical good unless the guilty line is scrupulous enough to bundle up incriminating documents located in a foreign country for dispatch across the ocean.

The act, in contrast, is readily enforced against the American-flag lines. Our witnesses are here and available. Our books are open to inspection or to production on demand. Any offense by us, as Congressman CELLER has amply proved, can readily be substantiated.

In consequence, the American-flag lines are, I believe, now in scrupulous adherence to the Shipping Act of 1916, while a good many of their foreign-flag competitors are free to offer rebates, special privileges, sub-agency commissions, and any other forbidden inducement to get cargo. Thus we are approaching the incredible situation of having the American operators subject to what amounts to Federal price control and their foreign competitors not. No business can long endure on such a basis. We have only one course to follow: to continue to lose cargo because of virtually immune violations of the law and the conference agreements by our competitors until the situation becomes intolerable, when we must break up the conference by opening rates or by resignation.

The breakdown of the conference machinery, which prevents ruinous price wars, is an ominous step for us to take, since we are the high cost carriers. Yet, even that is sometimes preferable to competing for cargo with our own hands tied by the iron chains of the Shipping Act while it is at best only a gossamer thread for our competitors.

As a result of this, a dozen major conferences—chiefly in the inbound trades—are on the threshold of a complete disintegration because of the Shipping Act of 1916. Not because it is a bad act on the pages of the statute books, but because any law is bad which can of necessity be enforced only against some while others are immune in every practical sense.

We have in American President Lines devoted much thought to this problem. On May 12 I sent to the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board a proposal which I believe would both improve enforcement of the act and remove the present discrimination against U.S.-flag lines. That in essence is to encourage the establishment of a private enforcement agency by the steamship conferences, ordinarily called neutral bodies, which would have the primary job of enforcing the conference agreements against rebates and other malpractices. They would be subject to continuous Board supervision, and the Board would be relieved, where a neutral body was functioning effectively of its demoralizing responsibility to enforce an act in situations where it cannot be enforced.

I believe legislation of this sort would work, but recognize that there can be difference of opinion on this score. I don't on the other hand believe there can be a difference of opinion as to the need for thoughtful and imaginative consideration of this problem.

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3891

famous Eichmann offered to trade one Jew for one truck, has the civilized world been confronted with such a heinous barter. Would it not be far more humanitarian to exchange food and medical supplies?"

The point is that all the Cuban people, not just the captured invasion fighters, are Castro's prisoners. It seems to me that our objective and the objective of the Organization of American States should be to free the Cuban nation, not just a few of its people.

Fifteenth Anniversary of the Founding of the Republic of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, we meet in a building that we call the Capitol in allusion to the seat of government in ancient Rome. Our Capitol is designed and built according to the principles of architecture that were formulated by Andrea Palladio of Vicenza who was born in Italy in 1518 and became one of the greatest architects of all times. When we pass through the rotunda our eyes are drawn upward to the work of Constantino Brumidi, the Italian artist, commissioned by the Congress to decorate the dome. In this Chamber of the House of Representatives the medallions bearing the faces of Gaius, Papinian, and Justinian, exponents of the Roman law look down upon our labors. With all of these tangible and visible reminders of the contributions of Italy and the Italian people to the culture and civilization of the world it is trite to review the accomplishments of that great nation as it celebrates the centenary of unification and as its approaches the 15th anniversary of the Republic of Italy.

I am, however, moved to speak briefly upon those intangible benefits that have been bestowed upon the United States by her sons and daughters of Italian origin. The Taliferro family has made a distinguished record in America since colonial times. William Paca, a Maryland Governor, was one of those who pledged his life, his fortune, and his sacred honor by signing the Declaration of Independence. The role is long and the debt incalculable.

In the centennial year of the unification of Italy and tomorrow, June 2, the 15th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Italy, I salute our fellow Americans who enjoy the great heritage of our sister republic and send particular greetings to the 150,000 Marylanders who join their relatives and friends in Italy in commemoration of this significant anniversary.

I particularly extend best wishes to Samuel A. Culotta, grand venerable of the Grand Lodge of the State of Maryland and the members of the Order of Sons of Italy in America, for an inspiring and significant commemoration of June 2.

A Doctor Advises Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. JOHN W. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Chattanooga Times of Monday, May 29, 1961, which sets forth and discusses the views of the able and distinguished new president of the Medical Association of Georgia, Dr. Fred H. Simonton, of Chickamauga.

Dr. Simonton's position bespeaks an original, refreshing, and courageous approach to the relationship of the medical profession with the general public. I wish to commend Dr. Simonton, whom I have known for many years, and for whom I have great respect, for his honesty and forthrightness, and I entertain the hope that his views may have a wholesome effect upon the profession which he so ably represents.

A DOCTOR ADVISES DOCTORS

Dr. Fred H. Simonton, of Chickamauga, Ga., has been installed as president of the Medical Association of Georgia. A former health director for Walker, Dade, and Catoosa Counties, he gave some new slants on what he considers should be the policies of the medical association when he delivered his installation address. He strongly criticized the public relations system of the medical profession.

He wants the association to correct in the public mind some of the opinions held by some people about the medical profession.

He is orthodox and wishes to retain the independence of the great profession, but he says "I want to warn you against the common practice of name calling. Every proposal for the medical care of the aged and indigent which we do not like is not necessarily Marxist, nor even undesirably socialistic. To denounce it as such is to place our profession in a most indefensible position before the public—not much better than that of the John Birch Society."

Dr. Simonton went on to say: "It is inconceivable to the American public that the medical profession should oppose any kind of public medical care for the aged. What we need to do is to tell the public what kind of program the profession thinks should be inaugurated, why we think so and why we oppose programs which we are against. The public is not convinced that we have any interest whatever in any patient who cannot afford our services."

Of course, though Dr. Simonton did not mention it, the public would applaud the medical profession if the people realized how extensive is the charity work of the profession. But the profession could not with dignity blow its own horn.

However, on welfare policies, Dr. Simonton proposed what may be a remedy for the lack of appreciation of the profession's motives. He flatly proposes: "If we have a story to tell, why don't we go ahead and tell it from the grassroots level, the county medical societies, instead of from the level of the American Medical Association?"

The new president of the Medical Association of Georgia seems to go along with the majority of the profession on general policy, for he says: "Let me in conclusion remind you that we are in a rapidly changing

world—political, social, economic, and technological, and we must continue to fight them to check the undemocratic and bureaucratic tendencies which accompany the inauguration of new procedures."

He urges that every society in the association start at once to try to implement the Kerr-Mills medical assistance plan for the aged and to see that it is operated at maximum efficiency throughout the State.

To do that, of course, will bring about a change in the public relations program of the State association. The inaugural address by the new president of the Medical Association of Georgia will be widely discussed, and many of his ideas will be brought before the people by the profession itself.

Politics in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the significance of the Texas Senate election results are well discussed in the following editorial, which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on May 31:

MESSAGE FROM TEXAS

Any election result, we suppose, can be minimized almost to the point of meaninglessness by noting the special factors that influenced it. And certainly there were special factors in the Texas Senate election.

This was a contest between a conservative Democrat and a conservative Republican. In that situation, many liberal Democrats apparently protest voted by not voting at all or by voting for the Republican, John Tower. As Mr. Novak notes on this page this morning such liberals preferred defeat to victory with a conservative Democrat. Even so, the balloting was close.

Still, the fact the political experts in Washington and elsewhere can't dodge is that a Republican did win the seat vacated by Vice President Johnson, the first such occurrence in nearly a century. At the least, the outcome is a considerable boost to Republican hopes for a two-party system in Texas, and even in other parts of the South. At the least, it strengthens the conservative Republican hand in what has been an increasingly liberal U.S. Senate.

Surely there are more than local implications in such a result. In general the GOP has often suffered from ineffective organization, but in Texas the party, though small, is vigorous with people really willing to work at politics. That would seem to suggest that poor organization is not necessarily an incurable Republican illness.

Nor can the conservative aspect be completely dismissed. Maybe conservative is too vague a term; but unquestionably Mr. Tower, like his opponent, stands for individual initiative and self-reliance against the overpowering expansion of the Central Government. And this straightforward stance for personal freedom was not without appeal.

It would undoubtedly be stretching things to say this one election proves an upsurge of such sentiments nationally. What can be fairly said, we think, is that a pro-freedom mood has long existed in this country but that the Republican Party has too often failed to present itself to the voters as the party of freedom.

So, despite the special factors, we think there are lessons here that go beyond the confines of Texas—not least, lessons for Republican politicians.

June 1

Control Will Follow Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot of Sunday, May 28, 1961:

CONTROL WILL FOLLOW AID

The drive for a full-scale program of Federal aid to education has reached a high water mark with passage of the school financing bill by the Senate.

Capitol observers agree that, while the bill may face considerable trimming in the House, the chances of approval of the principle of Federal aid are better now than at any time in the past.

Carefully shorn of controversial issues that might inspire resistance from areas with special interests, the bill is moving along. This might be the year.

We still are fearful, however, of the eventual results. Here we see the beginning of a school system which is controlled by Washington rather than by the people of the States and the local districts.

The aid which Michigan may receive under the formula found in the Senate bill would be rather expensive.

You, the taxpayers of the State, will be sending more money to Washington than you will be getting back. While you have shown a willingness to support your own schools, you will be called on to help out States which have been less willing—and which are attempting to lure away your industrial assets with such gimmicks as lower taxes.

Why Senators HARR and McNAMARA voted for the school aid bill is something that can be explained only by assuming that they go along with those who believe that all good comes from Washington and that the people of the States are not to be trusted to handle their own affairs.

It is ironic that the Senate acted on the measure, which will cost the Federal taxpayers an average of \$850 million per year for the next 3 years (and heaven only knows how much after that) on the day that the President recommended new spending programs for other purposes which, if approved, would bring the Federal deficit for the year up to around \$3.5 billion.

There is something almost dishonest in this lighthearted attitude toward Federal deficits. Is it right for the States to take handouts from Washington which are based on red ink financing, while they have the capacity to handle their own school problems if they will only do so? We think not.

As for that matter of eventual control of the schools by the Federal Government, we don't buy the line that the money will be forthcoming for all time with no strings attached.

In the first place, a legislative body which hands over \$2.55 billion (the cost of the 3-year program) without taking control of how it will be spent, is abdicating its responsibility.

In the second place, if the States start abusing the manna which may be forthcoming, there will be demands for control from the top. Let one big scandal develop and Congress will start calling the shots on how the money is spent. Those who believe otherwise are trying to put sugar on a pill that is very bitter to those who believe that local and State control of education is essential.

We hope the House can resist the pressure being exerted in behalf of the bill. If it can't, 1961 will be a sad year for education in America.

use of mob psychology—either to thwart the democratic process or to create martyrs for future needs.

This time, however, they were caught in the act. That is why American Reds and fellow travelers are now screaming—just as they have been since last May. They say they were grievously wronged by "police brutality" and "deliberate distortion" in the movie. Actually, they were caught with their pants down and their treason showing. This is the truth, and truth is one thing no Communist can stand.

Says Evans in his article in justification of keeping the bright light of truth constantly shining.

"The film, an official HUAC document, describes the demonstration as Communist-inspired, intermittently singling out one or another of the dramatic personae as a 'professional Communist agitator.' It sums up the episode as a frightening example of how guileless students can be manipulated by the Communist Party—700 copies of the film are in circulation, and some 15 million people have seen it—by and large, viewers react strongly to what they see; most find the film a startling presentation of what can happen even in America under Communist auspices.

"The net effect is to alert the viewer to the dangers of internal communism, to demonstrate that the House Un-American Activities Committee is doing a needed and often difficult job, and that enemies of the committee are sometimes less than courteous in their opposition to it."

Evans' conclusions are above question. Three men most intimately connected with the situation involved testify to the veracity of the film: FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, San Francisco Mayor George Christopher, and San Francisco County Sheriff Matthew Carberry. So sure are they that they have stood firm in their defense of the film despite the unending attacks from all sides by Communists and their dupes, including quite a few newspaper and magazine editors who have swallowed the party line along with the hook and sinker.

Against all this onslaught of calumny and untruth, "Operation Abolition" stands as a beacon. Everyone who considers himself a loyal and proud American owes it to himself to see this film, and owes the James Valley Christian High School, Principal James E. Lewis, and PTA President James Hohm a loud cheer for having the forcefulness of purpose and strength of loyalty to God and their country to sponsor its showing in Beadle County.

Abel Garner Honored by Congregation Zichron Ephraim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENGO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. ZELENGO. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I take pleasure in informing the House of a significant community event which took place in New York City on April 16, 1961. On that day the Congregation Zichron Ephraim celebrated its 71st year at a dinner at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel. The guest of honor was Mr. Abel Garner, one of the civic leaders and leading philanthropists of the city, and a trustee of the congregation.

Don't Miss "Operation Abolition"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a number of chambers of commerce, Legion, and VFW Posts, and enterprising women's organizations have been purchasing and showing the highly popular documentary film, "Operation Abolition," which has been sweeping the country with its objective portrayal of the Tokyo-like riots which the Communists inspired in San Francisco. These riots were so arrogant and destructive that the rioting mob virtually took over city hall in San Francisco disrupting court sessions and other official business.

Every American should see this film, Mr. President, and form his own conclusions as to whether communism at home is a danger we should curtail while stepping up our defenses against Communists abroad. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Don't Miss 'Operation Abolition'" from the Daily Plainsman, a great newspaper published in Huron, S. Dak., be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON'T MISS "OPERATION ABOLITION"

"Just who's distorting what," asks M. Stanton Evans, editor of the Indianapolis (Ind.) News in an article in National Review magazine. The subject: "Operation Abolition," the authoritative documentary film of the Communist-inspired and Communist-led student riots in San Francisco May 12, 13, and 14, 1960.

We of central South Dakota ourselves will have the opportunity to see this story of disgrace of our own Nation, Monday evening, when it will be presented at 8 p.m. in the auditorium of the James Valley Christian High School.

Last May, the House Un-American Activities Committee held a hearing in the San Francisco city hall. Professional Communist agitators took the opportunity to promote a student demonstration which ended in violence, willful disregard of law, and supreme disrespect to the democratic system.

Leading this rat pack, among others with Red connections so tight that they baffle the credulity of loyal Americans, was one Douglas Wachter, a University of California student who was an official delegate to the 1959 convention of the Communist Party.

While the HUAC was going about its duties, jeering students maligned the committee, attacked police, stormed the committee chambers, and were finally brought under control only, after patience had long since worn thin, by the use of fire hoses.

This is the story "Operation Abolition" tells how the international Communist conspiracy does every thing possible to disrupt proceedings which would expose it, to fill the scene of the hearings with demonstrators, to agitate them to violence through the

1961

substantially to the general public welfare. Direct mail advertising and order solicitation is the very lifeblood of this industry. It is unfortunate that some men, even those in high places, have seen fit to apply such a phrase to such a well recognized and effective business producing medium.

In recent years we have heard and read a great deal about the surplus of agricultural products. Particularly in the dairy industry, we have been asked by Government leaders to do more in the way of self and rely less on Federal subsidy. I have pointed out how in the past 20 years we have created an entirely new market for cheeses as gifts and have built that market to over 5 million pounds from our State alone. More than that, we have, by this method, introduced cheese into the diet of hundreds of thousands of potential new regular customers for the product. No other segment of the dairy industry, or of agriculture generally has done so much to promote the sale and use of its products as has the gift cheese industry.

A few years ago the senior Senator from Wisconsin, the Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY, speaking about a rate bill then before Congress said that postal rates "must be judged from the standpoint of how well we are serving the needs of our expanding economy." We ask now that you judge the requested third-class mail rates on that basis. It is our earnest hope that you will not enact a measure imposing such new and added costs on small businesses such as those which make up the Wisconsin Gift Cheese Association.

Cuba file

Must U.S. Funds Go to Castro's Cuba?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to a story appearing in the May 26, 1961, edition of the Washington Post under the headline "U.N. Backs Cuban Aid Despite United States." The story reported that the governing council of the U.N. Special Fund has given preliminary approval to a \$3,035,600 agricultural research project for Cuba, despite reservations by the United States and with some members of the council reportedly supporting the United States reservation.

The story in the Post said that Paul G. Hoffman, American managing director of the fund, submitted the project to the 18 member governing council along with 41 other projects calling for a total budget of \$77 million with the fund to supply \$34.6 million. All were approved.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I call to the attention of my colleagues the following letter which I addressed to the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, on May 26, 1961, in which I urged him to use his influence to block approval of the allocation of the United Nations funds to Castro's Cuba, particularly since 40 to 45 percent of the U.N. Special Fund is provided by the United States.

My letter to Mr. Stevenson follows:

MAY 26, 1961.

The Honorable ADLAI E. STEVENSON,
U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR Mr. AMBASSADOR: I read in the morning's Washington Post that the governing council of the U.N. Special Fund had given preliminary approval to a \$3,035,600 agricultural research project for Cuba.

The article went on to point out that the special fund would furnish over \$1,157,600 on a matching basis with the Castro government. It also went on to assert that the United States contributes between 40 and 45 percent of the special fund.

The only indication of objection on the part of this country was the statement that there were "reservations by the United States."

Our Government has made many mistakes in relation to Cuba and the Castro government, but we certainly would compound all the others by failing to prevent this ridiculous action. Castro has clearly shown that he is anti-American and he is doing everything possible to establish a Communist beachhead in this hemisphere. For the American people to provide him with nearly a half-million dollars to help make his regime more palatable to the Cuban people would be the height of folly.

I am not sure as to the jurisdictional questions that are involved as between yourself, as Ambassador, and Mr. Hoffman, as American managing director of the Fund, but I hope that you will immediately use your influence to see to it that this project is not approved.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.

Interview of Senator Magnuson on CBS Program "Capitol Cloakroom"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on May 18, 1961, Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, was interviewed on the CBS program "Capitol Cloakroom."

In view of the many significant observations made by Mr. MAGNUSON on the subject of broadcasting, I ask unanimous consent to have the transcript of the program printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERVIEW OF SENATOR MAGNUSON, DEMOCRAT, OF WASHINGTON, BY CBS NEWS CORRESPONDENTS CHARLES VON FREMD, ROBERT PIERPOINT, AND WELLS CHURCH ON CBS PROGRAM "CAPITOL CLOAKROOM"

Mr. VON FREMD. Senator MAGNUSON, should President Kennedy go to a summit meeting?

Mr. PIERPOINT. Does our space program need more money?

Mr. CHURCH. Is the broadcasting industry fulfilling its obligation, Senator MAGNUSON?

Mr. VON FREMD. Senator Magnuson, welcome once again to "Capitol Cloakroom." Your appearance today is particularly timely, for among your important committee as-

signments is Aeronautics and Space Sciences, and Alan Shepard's rocket ride has made us all space conscious these days. You are also Chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which, among other things, follows the activities of the Federal regulatory agencies.

So we also want your comments on FCC Commissioner Minow's recent observations about the networks.

But the overriding news today is the apparent meeting next month in Vienna, when President Kennedy and Soviet Premier Khrushchev get together.

So let's begin with this question:

Should President Kennedy go to a summit meeting with Mr. Khrushchev?

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, I, of course, believe, Mr. Von Fremd, that any time we can sit down with someone, we don't have too much to lose. We might be able to gain some of our objectives, particularly if the conference is prepared, the agenda, where they will discuss certain important matters and not be thrown off as to other matters that maybe cannot be solved, and get into some kind of a dispute or lack of agreement and completely miss some things where there might be an agreement.

President Kennedy is a very persuasive fellow, and a very likable fellow. And I am sure that Khrushchev will find a certain spirit of flexibility and understanding, more than he suspected he might have gotten when they set up the other summit conference, you know, that failed.

Mr. PIERPOINT. Well, Senator MAGNUSON, is it your understanding that this conference will be one where there will be a fixed agenda of certain problems to be solved, or will they simply talk over a lot of different world troubles?

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, it's my understanding that they will have a pretty fixed agenda to get right at, and to see if there can be some solution to some of the problems we now have that are pressing and are immediate.

I don't suppose there would be any restriction or suggestion that they couldn't, after they got at these problems, to see where we could, or how it might be worked out, where they might discuss many a variety of things.

Mr. CHURCH. It seems to me, Senator MAGNUSON, that the administration appears to be going toward the idea of just general discussion at such a summit meeting, and then letting the specifics be handled by, on the ambassadorial level.

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, the specifics, of course, would be the major reason for the conference. And then they would have general discussion, but surely there wouldn't be any reason to go to the ambassadorial level unless we found out, Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev found out at the original summit meeting that there was a possibility of the ambassadors or the other level to arrive at some solution.

So therefore the whole program would have to be discussed, some of the pressing problems. I suspect Laos, Cuba, the Geneva Disarmament Conference, many of those questions that are immediately pressing—Vietnam.

Mr. VON FREMD. Well, it seems to me, Senator MAGNUSON, though, that in most of these cases, the ones you have mentioned—Cuba, Laos, Berlin, and so forth—that the lines are so tightly drawn now between the two countries that one side or the other would have to make some kind of a break, unless we were to have another stalemate.

Senator MAGNUSON. That is correct. But that break—supposing there was evidence that somebody might make a break in this particular case. That would have to come

June 1

between Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev, because the other level wouldn't be authorized to make those breaks.

Mr. PIERPOINT. Are you optimistic, Senator, that there actually will be breaks in some of these trouble spots?

Senator MAGNUSON. I think there will be breaks. I think sometimes that, say Mr. Khrushchev states a position and Mr. Gromyko states a position, that sometimes the details are not quite understood, and there could be an understanding of details in these particular cases that might lead to a break. And then you might go from one step to another.

Mr. PIERPOINT. Specifically on Laos, sir, which of course is the subject of another conference, the one at Geneva, is it not true that the administration has, in effect, written off Laos, and that the Geneva Conference is simply a nice way of handing it over to the Communists?

Senator MAGNUSON. I don't have that impression, that we have written off Laos. I do have an impression that we have suggested that there should be some changes maybe made in Laos to make it closer to being neutral than might have been suggested by either Mr. Kennedy in the first instance, or Mr. Khrushchev in the first instance.

Mr. PIERPOINT. We do have some hope that it will be neutral then and not immediately slide from neutralism into communism.

Senator MAGNUSON. And the two of them in a summit conference may come to some agreement to not necessarily discard the one extreme or the other extreme, but at least get them to come together toward a more neutral point in the country.

Mr. VON FREMD. On another world trouble spot, nearby Cuba, it seemed to me, Senator, after the ill-fated invasion last month, that there was a strong body of opinion here on Capitol Hill, among the legislators, that this country should use force, if necessary, to get rid of Castro and get rid of him soon. And then since then, this atmosphere seems to have subsided a bit.

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, I think, of course, for about 48 hours following the so-called fiasco in Cuba, and the abuse that was being heaped upon the United States, to what extent we took part in it, how much prestige we lost, there was a strong feeling of resentment up here, and I'm not so sure that if somebody suggested we go down there and do something about it in a military way, that on that particular day they might have said, "All right."

But, I do think that Kennedy stopped a lot of that loosely formed opinion when he stood up and said, "I'll take the sole blame."

So we, in Congress, said, "Well, the President has assumed the blame, the sole blame; now we must sit down and let him proceed in such a way as he sees possible."

Well, now, it seems to me that no decision can be made regarding Cuba until we get the Organization of American States, at least the majority of them, or a substantial majority—I don't suppose we will ever get them all—but a substantial opinion on our side, because it might be just as ill-fated for us to go in there if all the other American states disagreed with it.

Mr. VON FREMD. Senator MAGNUSON, you are also a member of the Senate Space Committee. Certainly Commander Shepard's flight was a badly needed shot in the arm, but as President Kennedy himself said, we have to do more. Rather than just raise the question of, Do we have adequate appropriations for our space program, I wonder what you think should be added to it to make it adequate?

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, Von, of course I have handled the space appropriation in the Senate for some time now, and we have always recommended to the Senate just about what the experts down there ask for. In some instances we have prodded them a

little more and said, "Well, now, can't you proceed faster if we give you more money?"

In many cases they discouraged us giving them more money because they said, "We can't proceed any faster for one reason or another," it may be personnel, it may be the following through of technological problems involved that take some time.

Now, it's my understanding that because of the success of the Mercury and Shepard's great achievement that they are going to ask us for a little more to speed up, they think now they can speed up the time of putting a man up in space, clear in orbit.

Now, if they do ask us for that, why, I am sure there would be very little opposition to the request.

Mr. PIERPOINT. How much do you think they might ask you for, Senator?

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, I've heard in terms \$60 or \$70 million more that could do the speedup in this particular project.

Mr. VON FREMD. What about some of the other programs, though, like Centaur, Saturn, looking even further ahead to Pluto and some of the others. Do you think that you are going to be asked to step up appropriations substantially in these fields? I have heard the figure of \$600 million around town.

Senator MAGNUSON. I don't think so, because they feel that they are proceeding as rapidly as possible. Now, there may be some further appropriations asked by the Defense Department as the Polaris; I think we can do more on Polaris, so let's use that as an example.

But in the Space Agency itself, I think they think they are proceeding as fast as they can, and that money, extra money, wouldn't make much difference in the end result. And I think what we always ought to understand is that we—we have a 10-year program in the space scientists. We hope to come out at the end of that time with the things we want to know. We hope to come out looking as well as any other country involved, the Soviets or others, in this great new space development and space research. And sometimes it's a question of where you put the emphasis. There are so many facets to it.

Now, as we move along, we find that in one line of space activity, by the expenditure of more money, we can speed up the program. Maybe that would be completed by 7 years, but the whole program envisions a 10-year—a 10-year activity.

Russia, of course, has placed—the Soviets have placed the emphasis on rockets in space, not as much as we have on some of the other aspects of space, the scientific, pure scientific aspects.

But that's not unusual for Russia, because I think people also should realize that way back in 1900, what little scientific work they were doing in Russia under the czars was in the rocket field. We were making automobiles, combustion engines, we were going into refrigeration and all these consumer things that make a better way of life. They weren't doing anything about that. Even farm implements we were having researched. They weren't doing anything.

But, way back in 1898, there was a major rocket society of which the Czar of Russia was the chief sponsor.

Mr. VON FREMD. Senator MAGNUSON—
Senator MAGNUSON. And then after the Germans came along, in World War II, and got into this rocket field. Naturally, they moved some of their men, some wag said the other day, I heard that—the question of whether there is a gap between the Soviets and Russia and this missile and space field is just how many Germans we got and how many they got, because they [laughter] they made practical application.

Now, Russia may be emphasizing, we don't know exactly, this particular phase. But we are hopeful that over the long pull that our

achievements and our objectives will be just as sound and just as worthwhile as any other country or combination in the world.

Mr. VON FREMD. Senator MAGNUSON, you mentioned at the start of your answer to that question that on occasion the Congress had had to prod the Civilian Space Agency. When you have prodded, their answer has always been this 10-year plan that you are referring to?

Senator MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. VON FREMD. And they say that it's the orderly, step-by-step, proper way of doing things.

But is it going to be good enough just to have this paper plan over a 10-year period? Isn't there any way in this entire decade that we can find some way of leapfrogging or are we just going to have to resign ourselves to Russia's continued lead?

Senator MAGNUSON. Oh, I think we can do some leapfrogging, but we'll have to change—we'll have to rearrange, you see, the priorities.

Now, world conditions or situations may dictate that we rearrange a priority, that we maybe even slow down one aspect and beef up another aspect. Now, this is where the Space Committee, and the committee I'm on, Appropriations, too, I think can contribute something to this.

Mr. PIERPOINT. Are you considering some projects like this?

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, I think we are going to quiz them quite a bit in great detail on whether or not we can leapfrog the man in orbit, push that a little more, because of the dramatic aspects, the world, the psychological effect on the rest of the world, because it is dramatic.

Mr. PIERPOINT. When would you like to see this achieved by the United States?

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, I think if we can do it this year, we are in good shape. And if we can then do more about it and get the one to the moon, which is also another dramatic thing, I think it will all be helpful and then maybe we can proceed in an orderly fashion on our missile problem because as yet the relative military value of all the missiles we have, the great collection of missiles in some cases hasn't been exactly proven, whether one is better than the other, whether we should abandon one or go ahead, we have those constant arguments. And the military often changes their mind. They might be halfway in a program and decide well here is something new, something better, and this is the sort of guidance that we as armchair generals, as it were, could give them within the framework of what we can spend.

Mr. VON FREMD. When you sit there in the committee room and you hear all these military officials come up and testify about this program and that program and the other program, do you sometimes get the feeling that there are too many programs being put forward, that it might be better to emphasize, say, half a dozen major programs rather than going off in all directions?

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, there seems to be a lot of them, when you sit there and listen to them. I mean it gets a little confusing. But I do think that there has been suggestions that we consolidate the efforts or the thinking on maybe four or five rather than all of us—a great, a great spread of this missile program. I agree with you, there is some—but sometimes a lay member who tries to look at it objectively can offer some suggestions in this space race that we have and missile race that are better than the scientists who is working on them because he gets so involved in what he is doing he sometimes loses sight of the overall.

Mr. PIERPOINT. Senator MAGNUSON, are you going to continue to support this very expensive antimissile missile program, the Nike-Zeus program?